



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/994,284	11/26/2001	Sang Ick Lee	CU-2636 VE	8830
26530	7590	10/07/2003	EXAMINER	
LADAS & PARRY 224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE, SUITE 1200 CHICAGO, IL 60604			PHAM, THANH V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2823	

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/994,284	LEE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Thanh V Pham	2823	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,6,8 and 9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,6,8 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____   |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)        | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed 07/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant is thanked for providing the web site that teaches a conventional CMP. However, that process is not considered to be the same as applicant's admitted prior art using the same conventional CMP. In the rejection, the applicant's admitted prior art of figure's 1 and 2 is used in combination with another applicant's admitted prior art of CeO<sub>2</sub> slurry, which is the same as Maniar's slurry, which is the same as the instant invention's slurry in the CMP step to have the same selective ratio between the insulating interlayer and the gate metal layer.
3. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the same known CeO<sub>2</sub> slurry is treated in the same polishing process on the structure of fig. 2 or figures 3B-3C as in the instant invention would obtain the same selective ratio as recited.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 1-3, 5-6 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants' admitted prior art (in combination with Maniar et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,356,833) and the following.

The applicants' admitted prior art as explained in figures 1 and 2 and the background of the invention has a method of forming a gate in a semiconductor device *having a non-linear top profile (that is not different from the detailed description of the preferred embodiments referring to FIG. 3A to 3F), the method comprising the steps of:* forming a dummy gate insulating layer 2 on a semiconductor substrate 1 having a field oxide layer isolating the device (not shown, page 3, lines 13-14); depositing a dummy gate polysilicon layer 3 and a hard mask layer 4 on the dummy gate insulating layer 2 sequentially; patterning the hard mask 4 into a mask pattern 4a and patterning the dummy gate polysilicon layer 3 *and the dummy gate insulating layer* using the mask pattern as an etch barrier *to create a plurality of patterned dummy gate polysilicon and insulating layers each having sidewall, wherein the patterned dummy gate polysilicon and insulating layers are formed on the semiconductor substrate and on the field oxide layer;* forming spacers 6 at the sidewalls of the *patterned* dummy gate polysilicon 3 *and insulating layers;* depositing an insulating interlayer 7 on the resultant structure 5 after forming the spacers 6; exposing a surface of the *patterned* dummy gate polysilicon *and insulating layers* by carrying out an oxide layer CMP process, page 4, line 14, *using a*

*first selection ratio sufficient to polish the insulating layer but insufficient to polish the patterned dummy gate polysilicon and insulating layers; forming a damascene structure by removing the patterned dummy gate polysilicon and insulating layers using the insulating interlayer as another etch barrier, fig. 1D, page 4, lines 15-16 and page 5, lines 1-3; depositing a gate insulating layer 8 and a gate metal layer on the entire surface of the semiconductor substrate having the damascene structure, fig. 1E; and exposing a surface of the insulating interlayer by carrying out a metal chemical mechanical polishing process using a second selection ratio sufficient to polish the metal layer but insufficient to polish the insulating interlayer, the 'wave-like' profile of the top of the gates is inherently formed again.*

The metal CMP uses slurry for a metal layer, page 13, lines 6-19.

In the description of applicant's admitted prior art the applicant does not state the thickness of the dummy gate polysilicon layer or the insulating interlayer, the polishing selection ratios between the insulating interlayer and the dummy gate polysilicon layer is over 20 or the gate metal layer is over 50, **the using of CeO<sub>2</sub>** and its pH between 3 and 11 in the insulating interlayer CMP and the pH between 2 and 7 of the slurry in the metal layer CMP.

Choice of 1,300 to 2,000 angstroms for the gate layer and 4,000 to 5,000 angstroms for the interlayer to achieve particular device properties would have been a matter of routine optimization because the thickness is known to affect device properties and would depend on the desired device density on the finished wafer and the desired device characteristics.

Maniar et al. reference discloses use of  $\text{CeO}_2$  as slurry in CMP oxide removal process in the variation of topologies with a pH in a range of about 2-5 or the pH outside the range may be used (col. 4, lines 23-40 and col. 5, line 57 to col. 6, line 29).

Moreover, with the confirmation of applicants' argument that the CMP slurry disclosed in the cited Maniar et al. reference is one of a number of materials well known in the art (paper #7, page 3, line 1, filed 12/03/03), the recited selection ratios would be obtained in the process of the combination because the same *known* materials are treated in the same manner as in the instant invention.

### **Conclusion**

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2823

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh V Pham whose telephone number is 703-308-2543. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T (6:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Olik Chaudhuri can be reached on 703-306-2794. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

TvP  
TvP  
09/23/03

  
George Fourson  
Primary Examiner